

R E M A R K S

Claim 7 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This included changing "second media object" to "second media component" in order to provide the proper antecedent basis.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. in view of Ditmann et al. (Combine Video and Audio Watermarking: Embedding Content Information in Multimedia Data). Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox et al. and Ditmann et al., and in further view of Uz.

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the claims recite features neither taught nor suggested by Cox et al. in view of Ditmann et al. alone or combination with Uz. In particular, such features include "inserting the first part of the watermark into the first media component and inserting the second part of the watermark into the second media component", "inserting the first part into the first media component, and for inserting the second part into the second media component" and "extracting a first watermark part from the first media component, and for extracting a second watermark part from the second media component", as recited respectively in Claims 1, 5 and 11.

In addressing these features in the above rejections, Ditman et al. is being relied on. However, on page 455, paragraph 3, Ditman et al. discloses"


"We use watermarks to embed information in each media about the content of the other media."

Based on the above disclosure, it is evident that Ditman et al. embeds separate watermarks in each media. Thus, Ditman et al. cannot be reasonably interpreted as disclosing "inserting the first part of the watermark into the first media component and inserting the second part of the watermark into the second media component", "inserting the first part into the first media component, and for inserting the second part into the second media component" or "extracting a first watermark part from the first media component, and for extracting a second watermark part from the second media component", as required by the claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these features are distinguishable over Cox et al. in view of Ditmann et al.

In view of the above-described distinctions, it is respectfully submitted that the invention of Claims 1-14 is not made obvious by Cox et al. in view of Ditmann et al. alone or combination with Uz. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn so that the present application may proceed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Russell Gross, Reg. 40,007  
Attorney